UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/687,671	10/20/2003	Hou-Wei Lin	REAP0438USA	9341	
	27765 7590 05/03/2007 NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 506	A AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION	AM K			
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2611		
		•	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/03/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/687,671	LIN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sam K. Ahn	2611
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory or Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNI FR 1.136(a). In no event; however, may a n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI statute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on €	07 March 2007	
	This action is non-final.	,
3) Since this application is in condition for all		ters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und		
Disposition of Claims		. ·
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9 and 11-20</u> is/are pending in the	he application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9 and 11-13</u> is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-18</u> is/are rejected.	•	
7) Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.	
application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 March 2007</u> is/a	ire: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ ob	jected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	prrection is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)⊠ All b)□ Some *.c)□ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docun		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		received in this National Stage
application from the International Bu	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	reactived
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	inst of the certified copies not	receivea.
Attachment(s)		,
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) [] Into-view	Summani (PTO 413)

 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ___

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see p.12 and 14, filed 03/07/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1,7 and 10 under 102(e) and of claims 2-6,8,9 and 11-13 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Takatori et al. US 5,581,585.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
 Takatori et al. US 5,581,585 (Takatori) in view of Agazzi et al. US 2003/0007581

 (Agazzi, cited previously).

Regarding claim 14, Takatori teaches a feed-forward equalizer (FFE) of a communication system (see Fig.2) comprising: a multi-tap filter (22) for filtering a receiving signal (output of the first element 100), comprising: a plurality of delay elements coupled in series (100) for generating a plurality of delay signals (110) according to the receiving signal, each of the delay signals corresponding to a different delay (not a single, but different delay elements), each of the delay

Art Unit: 2611

signals corresponding to a middle delay among the different delays (middle delay of 100 among N delay elements); a plurality of multipliers (120, wherein one skilled in the art that the element 120 performs the function of a multiplier) for respectively multiplying the receiving signal (output of the first element 100) and the delay signals (110) by a plurality of parameters (210) and thereby generating a plurality of multiplied signals (outputs of 120), wherein at least one of the parameters remains fixed (140, note c.4, I.22) while the other parameters are adjusted to converged values (adjusted by 24) so as to accelerate the convergence of the communication system; and a summing circuit (130) for summing the multiplied signals (outputs of 120 and 140) to generate a filtered receiving signal (output of 130).

And although Takatori teaches automatic gain control (20 in Fig.2), does not explicitly teach a digital auto-gain controller (DAGC) coupled to the adaptive filter for adjusting the magnitude of the filtered receiving signal according to the parameters.

Agazzi teaches DAGC (34) in Fig.2 coupled to the output of FFE (34 coupled to 32). Hence, both Takatori and Agazzi teach a receiver receiving signals and applying FFE and AGC, wherein Agazzi further suggests that AGC is a digital AGC coupled to receive the output of FFE in order to provide signals accurately (note paragraph 0111) than PGA with analog AGC (220). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Agazzi in the receiver of Takatori by providing DAGC

of Agazzi coupled to the output of FFE 22 of Takatori for the purpose of provide signals accurately (note paragraph 0111).

Regarding claim 15, Takatori further teaches wherein at least two of the parameters remain fixed (see Fig.7, wherein the output of element N provides the first fixed value and output of 500 provides the second value) while the other parameters are adjusted (the rest of inputs to 120 are from 210 which are adjustable).

Regarding claim 16, Takatori further teaches all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 15. And although Takatori does not explicitly further teach wherein two of the multipliers respectively multiply two of the delay signals by the two fixed parameters, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement as such. Applicant has not disclosed that such implementation provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with a single multiplier for output of 500, while no multiplier is needed for the element N because 140 is the value by itself, hence is a value multiplied by one. One skilled in the art would recognize that this saves the overall production cost of the system, since a single multiplier multiplying by one does not need to be performed by a multiplier, rather provide the value directly to the adder 130.

Art Unit: 2611

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to obtain the invention as specified in the claim.

Regarding claim 17, Takatori further teaches wherein two of the multipliers 120 receiving output of 500, and 120 coupled to 140, as explained in regards to claim 16) respectively multiply two of the delay signals (output of N and N-1) by the two fixed parameters (output of 500 and unity or 1 for element N).

Regarding claim 18, Takatori further teaches wherein the two multipliers (explained above) utilizing the two fixed parameters are coupled adjacently (N and N-1 are adjacent).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 1-9 and 11-13 are allowed.
- 4. Claims 19 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: present application discloses a receiver comprising FFE, noise canceller, DAGC and a decoder. Prior art teaches all the combination of the elements. However, prior art does not explicitly teach the further limitation wherein the plurality of multipliers within the FFE having a center multiplier is multiplied with the fixed parameter.

Art Unit: 2611

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/687,671

Art Unit: 2611

Khanhong Tran 04/27/2007 JKHANH TRAN Primary Examiner

Sam K. Ahn Patent Examiner

Page 7

4/27/07